

REMARKS

Petition For Extension Of Time Under 37 CFR 1.136(a)

It is hereby requested that the term to respond to the Examiner's Action of May 7, 2007 be extended one month, from August 7, 2007 to September 7, 2007.

Authorization to charge a Credit Card is given to cover the extension fee. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 19-5425.

I. STATUS OF THE SPECIFICATION

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the Specification of the present invention, specifically to typographical errors in the paragraph beginning on page 2, line 28. In response, applicants have replaced the objected to paragraph with the amended paragraph included herein.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objection to the specification in light of this amendment.

II. STATUS OF CLAIMS

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 14 as containing typographical errors. Applicants have amended claim 14 as suggested by the Examiner. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the objection to claim 14.

Additionally, in the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 1 through 17 are pending in the application and the Examiner rejected all claims.

III. FORMALITY REJECTIONS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. In response, applicants have amended claim 9 as suggested by the Examiner. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Additionally, in the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed towards non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner rejected claim 15 as it does not appear to produce a concrete, tangible and useful result. In response, applicants have amended claim 15 to include “to produce a minimized JAR file” which is a tangible result. Claims 16 and 17 were both rejected as not reciting tangible article of manufacture. In response, applicants have amended both claims 16 and 17 to include “embodies on a computer readable medium,” resulting in a tangible article of manufacture. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. §101 in light of the current amendments.

IV. PRIOR ART CLAIM REJECTIONS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 7-9 and 13-17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Schmidt (U.S. Patent 6,535,894). Specifically, the Examiner states Schmidt teaches removing from a JAR file at least a portion of information not necessary for executing an application, mapping at least one of application defined interface, class, field

and method names to shorter names, and mapping at least one of target environment defined interface, class, field and method names to corresponding target device names. In response, applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner and present the following arguments.

A. Schmidt Fails to Disclose Removing Information From a JAR File

To anticipate a claim, each element taught in that claim must be found in a single prior art reference. As currently pending, independent claims 1, 14, 15, 16 and 17 recite removing from a JAR file any information unnecessary for executing a particular application. This is done to reduce the size of the JAR file and improve system efficiency.

On the other hand, the system of Schmidt does not modify a single JAR file by removing unnecessary information as is specifically claimed in the presently claimed invention. Rather, Schmidt produces additional copies of the JAR file configured differently for different possible client system configurations. Referring to Schmidt figure 7 and the accompanying text (col. 9, l. 65 – col. 11, l. 21), the steps taken by the system of Schmidt are shown and described. In Step 710, an original archive file is created, and a target archive file is created in Step 720. Typically, this target archive file includes an updated version of the program code contained in the original archive file. In Step 730, a difference file is created. This file documents the differences between the original archive file and the target archive file. The difference file is then sent to a client who can analyze the difference file to determine which archive file the client can run.

Nowhere does Schmidt disclose modifying a JAR file by removing unnecessary information not needed for executing an application as is specifically claimed by the presently

claimed invention. Thus, Schmidt fails to disclose Applicants' claimed invention. As such, independent claims 1, 14, 15, 16 and 17 patentably define over Schmidt. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection.

V. CONCLUSION

The present invention is not taught or suggested by the prior art. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims. An early Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 19-5425.

Respectfully submitted,

August 22, 2007
Date

/John R. Brancolini/
Jeffrey Wannamaker et al.
by:
John R. Brancolini
Registration No. 57,218
Agent for Applicants

SYNNESTVEDT & LECHNER LLP
1101 Market Street
Suite 2600
Philadelphia, PA 19107

Telephone: (215) 923-4466
Facsimile: (215) 923-2189